

HOUSING SERVICES DIRECTORATE RISK REGISTER

Appendix 1

Financial Year:	2009/10
Directorate:	Housing Operations
Executive Director:	Gill Moy
Risk Register:	Directorate
Relevant SIPs & Service Area Risk Registers:	Access & Customer Care (ACC) Tenancy & Estate Management (TEM) Supported Housing (SH) Caretaking & Estates Services (C&ES), Voids & Allocations (VA) Housing Income Management (HIM) Leasehold & Recharges (LH)
Risk Register Responsible Officer (RRRO)*:	Gill Moy / Mark Lawson

	QR1	QR2	QR3	QR4
Date of Update and Review:		7th October 2009		
RRRO Signature:		Mark Lawson		
Date of Review and Approval:		21st October 2009		
Executive Director Signature:		Gill Moy		

KEY: -

* - see Guidance worksheet item **xviii**) for definitions

Risk Register Colour Key:-

	= Corporate
	= Directorate
	= Service Area
	= Project/Partnership

RISK REGISTER

**HOUSING OPERATIONS DIRECTORATE REGISTER:
QUARTER 3, 2009-10**

INCLUDES ALL MEDIUM & HIGH RESIDUAL RISKS

Appendix 1

Risk Number	Description of Risk	Description of Potential IMPACT (with estimated costs if possible)	Description of LIKELIHOOD Factors	Risk Owner	Date Risk Raised	Inherent / Prevailing Risk			Countermeasures & Additional Controls / Mitigations / Actions (including SIP references where relevant)	Action Owner	In Operation Target Date	Residual Risk		
						LIKELIHOOD Rating	IMPACT Rating	RISK Score				Residual LIKELIHOOD Rating	Residual IMPACT Rating	Residual RISK Score
Objective: Deliver excellent customer focused services.														
1	Directorate: Failure to meet the needs and aspirations of tenants and leaseholders by delivering services customers want & deliver value for money	Reduced satisfaction with services. Unable to meet needs or aspirations of customers. Increased costs.	Need to modernise & change not always welcomed by some customers or staff. Initial costs of change. Perceived loss of service during changes.	Director of Housing	01/12/2009	4	5	20	Accommodation review & Customer Contact Centre. Cash Review & office closures. Consultation with customers/ stakeholders Effective communication	Mark Lawson	31/03/10	3	4	12
2	SP2: Failure to have Supporting People contracts reviewed.	Loss of contracts, poses financial risk to Company = increased central costs. Impact upon reputation. Risk to tenants that NOC not delivered locally.	Previous SP contract been lost. SP funding arrangements potentially changing. All SP services have to be tendered.	Supported Housing Manager	01/04/2008	4	5	20	Review of Supported Housing Service will include review of costs. Joint work with NCC and Supporting People. SIP Action Plan/Business Plan. Housing Services Committee Working Group.	Supported Housing Manager	31/03/10	3	4	12
3	SP3: Ensure BME communities are able to access sheltered housing.	BME communities under represented in sheltered housing schemes. Direct or indirect discrimination against groups. Legal challenge. Ombudsman challenge. Sheltered schemes under occupied. Loss of revenue Potential for BME communities to be isolated in schemes.	BME communities not aware of sheltered schemes as housing option. Failure to consult/engage BME communities in housing options. Policy review.	Interim Head of Rents & Housing Registration & Allocations Manager/ Supported Housing Manager	01/04/2008	3	3	9	SP SIP Action 1.8 Work with partners and stakeholders to ensure this area is covered Review of allocation policy Monitoring of BME within the service area . Drive to raise cultural awareness in sheltered schemes. Marking and communication plan introduced to capture this.	City Lettings Manager/ Supported Housing Manager	30/11/09	3	2	6
4	SP5: Failure to comply with Supporting People service requirements of producing needs assessments prior to allocation.	Reductions in grant income in future years. Lack of a needs assessment prior to allocation of properties. Failure to meet the required needs of individuals when allocating properties. Failure to provide individuals with the support required to enable them to remain in the community.	Ability to complete during application stage and failure to use at allocation by home link. Ability to achieve performance targets and secure TSA accreditation.	Interim Head of Rents & Housing Registration & Allocations Manager/ Supported Housing Manager	01/04/2008	4	3	12	SIP Action 1.10 Three central lettings managers working to the needs assessments put into place. Part of the fundamental allocations review with NCC. Ongoing action with V & A work in progress.	City Lettings Manager/ Supported Housing Manager	31.03.10	2	3	6
5	HIM7: Failure to provide a flexible/extended service/ operation.	Service not accessible to all. Inability to make contact with some debtors and ensure effective rent/income recovery.	Level of reluctance to change, HR, Unions, changes to employees terms & conditions, potential cost, staff reluctance, health & safety.	Rent & Leasehold Service Manager	01/04/2009	4	3	12	Mobile & home working to mitigate changes to work practices. Rents call centre will become 24/7 as part of consolidated call centre. Paypoint & Post Office offer extended opening hours to take payments.	Rent and Leasehold service Manager	31/03/09	3	2	6
6	LH3: Adverse effect of negative publicity for Recharges raised	Services do not meet the needs & aspirations of customers. Low satisfaction with service and potential loss of income	Training . Vulnerability issues Availability of resources - time and £ Conflicting judgements from staff	Leaseholder & Rechargeable Repairs Manager	11/06/2009	4	3	12	Ensure customer information e.g. recharges leaflet is up to date. Ensure evidence will uphold the charge and customers are made aware of recharges. Quality groups and regular training	Leaseholder & Rechargeable Repairs Manager	In operation and ongoing	2	3	6
7	LH4: Increase in bills to leaseholders through Secure Warm Modern Programme	Leaseholders faced with large repair bills	Availability of budget to meet these costs Programme of works specifically for leaseholders	Leaseholder & Rechargeable Repairs Manager	11/06/2009	3	3	9	Financial questionnaire was sent to all leaseholders to establish needs and enhanced payment options are being made available through the new service charge module e.g. DD	Leaseholder & Rechargeable Repairs Manager	In operation and ongoing	2	3	6

Risk Number	Description of Risk	Description of Potential IMPACT (with estimated costs if possible)	Description of LIKELIHOOD Factors	Risk Owner	Date Risk Raised	LIKELIHOOD Rating	IMPACT Rating	RISK Score	Countermeasures & Additional Controls / Mitigations / Actions (including SIP references where relevant)	Action Owner	In Operation Target Date	Residual LIKELIHOOD Rating	Residual IMPACT Rating	Residual RISK Score
8	VA3: Ensure BME communities are able to access sheltered housing	BME communities under represented in sheltered housing schemes. Potential direct or indirect discrimination against minority groups. Legal or Ombudsman challenge. Sheltered schemes under occupied; loss of revenue. Potential for BME communities to be isolated in schemes.	BME communities not aware of sheltered schemes as housing option. Failure to consult/engage BME communities in housing options.	Interim Head of Rents & Housing Registration & Allocations Manager	Apr-09	3	3	9	CLG project & work with partners. Review of Allocations Policy & Low Demand Strategy [SIP Refs. 1.6 & 3.14]. Drive to raise cultural awareness in sheltered schemes. Project Rhanama & rehousing of Zimbabwean nationals. Marketing and Communication plan and Focus Group [SIP Ref. 1.2]. Older Person's Roadshow and other similar events	City Lettings Manager/ Supported Housing Manager	31/03/10	3	2	6
9	VA6: Failure to upgrade and improve Choice Based Lettings' (CBL) IT systems.	Inefficient inputting of registrations, bidding & shortlisting. Failure to secure and evidence Value for Money. Outdated IT systems and inadequate IT infrastructure.	Availability and compatibility of alternative IT systems. Level of budget provision to finance upgrades and system improvements.	Interim Head of Rents & Housing Registration & Allocations Manager	Apr-09	3	4	12	Business process review to highlight IT issues impacting on the operational efficiency of CBL. Ongoing negotiations to improve enhancements to the IT system held with Northgate. Outcome of Lean System review	Housing Registration & Allocations Manager	01/03/10	2	3	6
10	TEM1.2: Failure to apply policies and procedures resulting in discrimination	Service open to direct or indirect discrimination. Poor customer satisfaction. Reduction in tenant engagement. Open to Ombudsman review Open to Legal challenge financial risk to Company	Lack of training. Corruption. Capability issues. If procedures are not up to date and reviewed on a regular basis.	Assistant Director - TEM	2008-2009	3	4	12	SIP 2.2, 3.5, 3.19 ISO accreditation achieved Audit internal and external. Training plans and coordinated team briefings 3C's process. TEAM. EIA. Full procedural review 90% complete. Successful ISO audit in November 2009. Training for managers on EIA and IT reviews took place in November/December 2009.	Area Housing Managers	31.03.10	2	4	8
11	TEM1.4: Failure to provide effective, accurate and timely housing advice.	Inconsistent service provision for customers. Open to legal challenge. Open to Ombudsman challenge Reputational damage Reduced customer satisfaction	Level of consistent knowledge and skills amongst staff. Training . Capability issues Availability of resources - time and £	Assistant Director - TEM	2008-2009	5	5	25	SIP 3.5, 3.19, 3.21 Comprehensive and compulsory training programme for all staff with regular assessments of employees skills and capabilities, e.g. Wednesday morning tests. ISO Development of mobile technology. New PI's developed Protocols with partner organisations Business Plan/Service Improvement Plan . As new procedures introduced, training to take place on Wednesday mornings. EPDRs and One to ones. ASB and REACT training for front line staff in late 2009/early 2010	Area Housing Managers	31.03.10	3	5	15

Risk Number	Description of Risk	Description of Potential IMPACT (with estimated costs if possible)	Description of LIKELIHOOD Factors	Risk Owner	Date Risk Raised	LIKELIHOOD Rating	IMPACT Rating	RISK Score	Countermeasures & Additional Controls / Mitigations / Actions (including SIP references where relevant)	Action Owner	In Operation Target Date	Residual LIKELIHOOD Rating	Residual IMPACT Rating	Residual RISK Score
12	TEM1.5: Failure to manage anti social behaviour.	Poor service provision and deterioration of estates Increased court costs. Legal challenges. Increased dissatisfaction with service Lost of rental income from voids; Maintenance costs for void and tenanted properties; Service cost for communal areas; Compensation payments; Re-housing costs; Mediation and support services; Staff time; Increased insurance premiums and higher excesses.	Level of coordination between NCH, CP and Police. Consistency of approach and degree of quality of staff dealing with ASB.	Assistant Director - TEM	2008-2009	3	3	9	SIP 1.17, 3.4, 3.5, 3.7, 3.11 Improved coordination and streamlining of communication with Neighbourhood Action Teams. Improved management of staff dealing with ASB ASB performance framework established Improved operational joint working arrangements with Community Protection. Revised ISO procedure Case management and monitoring system implemented training taken place - refresher training completed. Cases reviewed monthly with partner agencies at ASB Panels. Improved victim/witness reporting methods e.g website ASB Accreditation achieved . ASB and REACT training for front line staff in late 2009/early 2010.	Area Housing Managers	31.03.10	2	3	6
Objective: Engage customers in influencing the shape and quality of housing services that we provide.														
13	TEM2.1: Failure to develop Area Panels.	Customers not involved in creating future developments within NCH and not scrutinising company performance.	Level of interest and attendance by customers. Degree of representation of local groups and the community by the panels and the attendees. Degree of delegation, responsibility and power given to Area Panels e.g. delegated budgets.	Assistant Director - TEM	2008-2009	3	3	9	Focus TP staff and HPMS to encourage and develop new and existing panel members. Board and EMT to devolve some powers to Area Panels. Marketing and promotional campaigns. Appointment of new TLIO's with responsibility for AP. Getting involved weeks. Use of profiling data to target groups and individuals. Work needed on powers and devolved budgets for area panels. Panels have forward plans. Contained with resident involvement SIP. Panel involved in decision making, eg rent increases and environmental schemes	Area Housing Managers	31.03.10	2	3	6
Objective: Be a key partner in the delivery of safe and sustainable neighbourhoods.														
14	VA8: Failure to meet lettable standard	Higher refusal rate, leading to worsening ART. Reduced revenue through increased void rental loss. Reduced customer satisfaction & Reputational risk. Health & Safety issues.	Limited budget provision. Training/ Capability issues. Resources - time and £.	City Lettings Manager	Apr-09	4	4	16	Lettable standard developed with increased monitoring of quality & compliance [SIP Refs. 3.4 & 3.5]. Void Quality Assurance plan. Tenant Services Inspection Team. Weekly inspections by Void Project Manager & Technical Project Manager & monthly inspections by AD & TSIT. New Surveyors in place & post inspection of all properties, including inspection proforma. Show garden developed as training aid for staff	Voids Technical Project Manager	01/03/10	3	3	9
15	VA11: Ineffective links between lettings and asset management and NCC retained housing service	Increased number of low demand properties. Loss of revenue. Ineffective use of housing stock. Investment in stock which has no long term future = poor VFM and risk to reputation.	Level and number of properties considered to be in low demand, awaiting decisions from NCC. Strategic and operational management. Planning for regeneration.	City Lettings Manager	Apr-09	3	4	12	Establish effective strategic and operational arrangements - action plan developed Monthly Operational Asset Management meeting between NCH & NCC. Regeneration agenda. Housing Forum meetings Decommissioning Project Meetings with NCC	City Lettings Manager	01/03/10	2	3	6

Risk Number	Description of Risk	Description of Potential IMPACT (with estimated costs if possible)	Description of LIKELIHOOD Factors	Risk Owner	Date Risk Raised	LIKELIHOOD Rating	IMPACT Rating	RISK Score	Countermeasures & Additional Controls / Mitigations / Actions (including SIP references where relevant)	Action Owner	In Operation Target Date	Residual LIKELIHOOD Rating	Residual IMPACT Rating	Residual RISK Score
16	TEM3.2: Failure to assess support needs and arrange suitable support for customers.	Inconsistent or non existent service provision for customers. Potential unsustainability and increased stock turnover.	Quality of staff knowledge and understanding. Level of coordination between staff, service providers and customers.	Assistant Director - TEM	2008-2009	3	5	15	SIP 1.6, 2.2, 3.5 Incorporate in training plan for staff and better information and publicity of service providers. New tenancy visits and push on Biennial Tenancy Visits . Staff training completed. Support needs assessment. Await outcome of sheltered housing review.	Area Housing Managers	31.03.10	2	5	10
Objective: Be a key partner in the transformation of Nottingham's neighbourhoods.														
17	TEM4.1: Failure to identify potential properties, sites and estates for disposal which presents management issues which results in failure to support decent homes programme.	Wasting resources on unsustainable sites and a lack of coordination with Property Services. Possibly open to disrepair, e.g. Kingsthorpe Close.	Level and adequacy of board decisions on long term future of some of the difficult to maintain and manage stock.	Assistant Director - TEM	2008-2009	5	5	25	Meetings with Property Services established. Board and EMT to make medium and long term decisions as to the viability of certain elements of the stock. Better working relationships with Property Services SRF plans being drawn up by NCC. Business Plan/Asset Management Strategy. Working groups with NCC, e.g. sustainability and decommissioning. Work with NCC to agree future actions. Decommissioning of Kingsthorpe Close, Duffield Court and Rosecroft Drive underway. NCC possible disposal of other stock. Garage sites identified for potential decommissioning.	Assistant Director - TEM	31.03.10	2	5	10
18	TEM4.2: Failure to help support the delivery of the Decent Homes Programme.	Delay with programme resulting in more customer complaints. Lack of information about programmes in local area. Frustrated contractor issues such as access	Best use of TLOs. Building working relationships with Property Services and contractors	Assistant Director - TEM	2008-2009	3	5	15	Regular agenda item at team meetings, AHMs, EDMT and Area Panels. SWM Customer Clinics planned for early 2010. HPs now attending meetings with SWM partners	Area Housing Managers	31.03.10	2	5	10
19	TEM4.3: Failure to effectively manage estate inspections and environmental schemes and failure to achieve 2 star ratings for all estates.	Poor service provision and deterioration of estates. Possibly open to legal challenges. Reduced satisfaction with neighbourhoods. Increased crime and ASB	Level and adequacy of coordination between NCH, NCC - Street Scene, environmental health and other service providers.	Assistant Director - TEM	2008-2009	3	5	15	SIP 3.8, 3.10 Clarification on role of neighbourhood management and its links to the management of estates and environmental schemes. Better reporting by staff on estate inspections. Development of mobile technology. All estates now at least 1* Tenant Inspectors and mystery shopping Estate evaluation with tenants and partners. Pilot scheme at Clifton looking at enhancing links between NCC and NCH. Weeks of action to include estate inspections to raise profile. Use of Finance from Street Scene for mini weeks of action.	Area Housing Managers	31.03.10	2	5	10
Objective: Be an excellent organisation.														
20	SP7: Failure to implement the findings of the Supported housing review	Failure to improve service delivery in line with the needs of the Service User. Low customer satisfaction with limited opportunity for customers to participate in future plans for the service. Possible outsourcing of the service. Loss of SP contract	Level of input from staff and understanding of the service. Level of interest and 'buy-in' from customer groups during key consultation.	Supported Housing Manager	01/05/2009	5	5	25	SIP Action 3.4 Action Plan based on recommendations from consultancy work produced for Board. Housing Services Committee Working Group.	Supported Housing Manager/ AD TEM	31.03.10	2	3	6

Risk Number	Description of Risk	Description of Potential IMPACT (with estimated costs if possible)	Description of LIKELIHOOD Factors	Risk Owner	Date Risk Raised	LIKELIHOOD Rating	IMPACT Rating	RISK Score	Countermeasures & Additional Controls / Mitigations / Actions (including SIP references where relevant)	Action Owner	In Operation Target Date	Residual LIKELIHOOD Rating	Residual IMPACT Rating	Residual RISK Score
21	HIM5: Inability to meet Rent collection targets.	Reduction in HRA income & Company management fee. Reduction in funding services. Impact on Inspection.	Levels of adherence to procedures, staffing levels, competency, training, increasingly difficult collection conditions.	Interim Head of Rents & Housing Registration & Allocations Manager	01/04/2009	3	5	15	Procedures, management controls, partnership working, weekly & monthly monitoring drilling down to causes. Review of processes Business Plan . Individual targets. On line rent statements. See HB actions below	Rent and Leasehold Service Manager and Rents Operations Managers, Rent Account Managers	On -going (weekly)	2	5	10
22	HIM6: Failure to support tenants to access Housing Benefit and maximise income generally	Failure to meet collection targets. Reduction in HRA income and Company management fee. Increase in poverty amongst tenants. Increased evictions Increased in tenants accessing door step lenders	ICT interface is solid. Benefit processing performance. Level of communication. Changes in Benefit regulations. Potential for expansion of Local Housing Allowance.	Interim Head of Rents & Housing Registration & Allocations Manager	01/04/2009	3	4	12	NCH/ Benefits Protocol prescribes joint working & relationship/ escalation measures if required. HB Leen system review City-wide. Financial Inclusion Strategy and Business Plan s - SP bid for additional FIO's On line access to HB calculator. Money Matters leaflet. Benefit awareness campaign. Money Matters.	Rent and Leasehold service Manager	31/03/10	2	3	6
23	HIM12: Failure to deliver Value for Money when service outcomes are measured against customer expectation and similar organisations.	Higher costs/ low collection performance could result in higher rents/ loss of services & low customer satisfaction. Could lead to service being out sourced	Level of costs incurred until collection performance reaches target. Previous culture of non payment/collection within organisation and amongst tenants	Interim Head of Rents & Housing Registration & Allocations Manager	01/04/2009	4	3	12	Demonstrate VFM by improving performance & reducing costs per the Rents Business Plan when performance reaches target. Culture change programme. Revised procedures. Numerous examples of VFM in the section. Benchmarking group attendance	Rent and Leasehold service Manager	31/03/10	2	3	6
24	HIM13: Failure to make significant progress in the collection of Former Tenants Arrears.	More money needs to be set aside for the provision of bad debt.Reputation of Service.	Specialist resource lacking. Lack of awareness of issues. Effect on re-housing of former tenants. Abandments increasing.	Interim Head of Rents & Housing Registration & Allocations Manager	01/04/2009	4	3	12	Business Improvement Request. 'Spend to Save initiative. Specialist training. Robust procedures. Bid being considered by N.C.C. for two new posts dealing with FTA's.	Rent and Leasehold Service Manager and Rent Operations Managers	On-going.	3	3	9
25	VA14: Failure to have a robust performance management framework in place.	Increased ART. Increased numbers of lettable voids & reduced revenue collection. Reduction in customer satisfaction levels.	Ability to embed performance management amongst void & allocations team members to deliver service improvement.	Interim Head of Rents & Housing Registration & Allocations Manager	Apr-09	2	4	8	Implementation of robust performance management framework to improve performance [SIP Ref. 3.15]. Training for new staff [SIP Ref. 1.9]. LEAN Systems Review to commence Aug-09 [SIP Ref. 3.2].	City Lettings Manager	01/03/10	2	3	6
26	VA16: Failure to control costs and remain within agreed budgets.	Increased void times and increased cost of average void. Reduced revenue collection.	Limited Budget Provision. Adequacy of systems in place to monitor costs of service & average void costs. Ability to manage budget overspends & the high average cost of repairing void properties.	Interim Head of Rents & Housing Registration & Allocations Manager	Apr-09	4	4	16	Improved budgetary controls & forecasting for costs of void properties [SIP Ref. 3.21]. Strengthened monitoring mechanisms and use of finance support. Review painting & decorating provision [SIP Ref. 4.1]. Revised lettable standard	Service Improvement Manager (Prop Services)	01/03/10	3	3	9
27	VA17: Failure to improve security arrangements for void properties.	Security arrangements for void properties do not meet the required standard. Increase in unsecured properties leading to increased vandalism and cost of refurbishment to lettable standard. Blight on estates which causes low customer satisfaction.	Ability to closely performance manage contractor. Level and frequency of on-site quality inspections undertaken to measure quality of service.	Interim Head of Rents & Housing Registration & Allocations Manager	Apr-09	2	4	8	Revision and improvement to the quality of security arrangement for void properties in order to meet the required standard [SIP Ref. 3.24]. Consideration of the practicality and likely success of punitive action against contractor(s) to recover NCH losses. Monthly meeting with contractor, including property inspections	Voids Technical Project Manager	01/03/10	2	3	6

Risk Number	Description of Risk	Description of Potential IMPACT (with estimated costs if possible)	Description of LIKELIHOOD Factors	Risk Owner	Date Risk Raised	LIKELIHOOD Rating	IMPACT Rating	RISK Score	Countermeasures & Additional Controls / Mitigations / Actions (including SIP references where relevant)	Action Owner	In Operation Target Date	Residual LIKELIHOOD Rating	Residual IMPACT Rating	Residual RISK Score
28	TEM5.1: Failure to achieve KPIs including customer care, ASB and visits.	Poor service provision and poor performance information. Possibly open to legal challenge. Reduced customer satisfaction	Training . Capability issues Availability of resources - time and £ Performance by partners and other departments which impact upon perceptions and service delivery	Assistant Director - TEM	2008-2009	2	5	10	SIP 1.12, 1.16 ,1.17, 3.4, 3.5, 3.7, 3.11, 3.19, 3.21 EPDRs and 1 to 1s implemented throughout TEM with clear training plans developed. Development of mobile technology. New PIs developed Protocols with partner organisations Business Plan/Service Improvement Plan. ASB VMS results improving. REACT introduced and training has taken place. Accommodation strategy and budget issues link to sharing of resources. Better use of team brief and potential testing/assessments Review of performance management underway. Office of the month competition.	Area Housing Managers	31.03.10	1	5	5
29	TEM5.2: Failure to work together with all parts of the Company as One Team.	Uncoordinated and inconsistent service provision, e.g. task duplication and staff frustration with colleagues and restructure.	Ability of customers and staff to differentiate and avoid confusion as to the service provider.	Assistant Director - TEM	2008-2009	4	3	12	SIP 3.20 Better communication and understanding of roles and impact on teams and customers - at all levels of the Company. Work planned to ensure TEM work more effectively with Property Services eg decants and exchanges. Brainstorming sessions at EDMT on cross cutting areas. Joint meetings held between Property Services and TEM - including managers and HPMS	Area Housing Managers	31.03.10	3	3	9
30	TEM5.3: Failure to manage housekeeping at Area Housing Offices.	Inconsistent service provision for customers. Disorganised staff Accuracy of records. Untidy Offices	Ability to manage vacancy rates during elongated restructure. Capacity to make improvements to back office accommodation.	Assistant Director - TEM	2008-2009	4	3	12	SIP 3.5 Marketing strategy Office of month and mystery shopping DDA works in some offices Review of all marketing materials Children play areas. Accommodation Strategy to be implemented Housefile procedure reviewed and to be relaunched. Regular 'spring' cleans in offices. ISO and audits. Ongoing audit of housefiles.	Area Housing Managers	31.03.10	2	3	6
31	TEM5.4: Failure to effectively manage staff and performance and improve consistency of procedures.	Inconsistent or non existent service provision for customers. Demotivated and unfocused workforce. Possible increase in grievance, disciplinarys and sickness.	Ability to implement a transparent company structure. Level of and impact of publicity. Degree of adequate management skills. Ability to clarify and uncomplicated capability procedure. Level of consistent performance information. Capability of all managers to apply procedures consistently	Assistant Director - TEM	2008-2009	4	5	20	SIP 3.19, 3.21 Training Plan, easy to use capability procedure, management training for managers and agreed and consistent performance information. Develop PIs for clericals, advisors and managers. Develop new procedures in line with ISO guidelines. Culture change programme. Training handbook launched and PDPs in place - Skills matrix in place. Better coordinated team briefs with testing/assessments. Successful ISO audit November 2009	Area Housing Managers	31.03.10	3	5	15

Risk Number	Description of Risk	Description of Potential IMPACT (with estimated costs if possible)	Description of LIKELIHOOD Factors	Risk Owner	Date Risk Raised	LIKELIHOOD Rating	IMPACT Rating	RISK Score	Countermeasures & Additional Controls / Mitigations / Actions (including SIP references where relevant)	Action Owner	In Operation Target Date	Residual LIKELIHOOD Rating	Residual IMPACT Rating	Residual RISK Score
Off-Plan Objectives - Other duties, responsibilities & challenges.														
32	SP8: The 'Credit Crunch' and down turn in the UK's economy increases the need for supported housing resources above those available.	High impact on quality of service delivery and related customer satisfaction. Inability to take on new business and/or secure additional future income streams. Services are provided to customers without the full costs being recovered. Inability to maintain provision of a 2/3 star service to customers.	Level of funding and required current and future year budget savings. secure TSA accreditation. Level of staffing resources. Level of associated budget provision to cope with call traffic. Degree to which the Supported housing structure is 'Fit for Purpose' and related efficiencies. Ability to identify and clarify what customers are receiving for their service charge and make adequate and timely recoveries. Ability to embed VFM across the Supported Housing Service Area and engage key managers and supervisors in the process.	Supported Housing Manager	01/01/2009	4	3	12	Ensure a correct charging structure is in place that reflects the charge of service delivery. Three monthly checks that all invoices are created and paid on time. Action plan and cost analysis to be created. VMS focus group established to meet monthly to look at ensuring NCH meets the needs of customers with the services we deliver. Regular performance data to be analysed showing any drop in performance within NOC. Supported Housing Manager is a member of the newly reformed VFME Group which meets monthly.	Supported Housing Manager	On going	3	3	9
33	C&ES7: Failure to secure Value for Money and adequate service provision within building cleaning and sheltered scheme Service Level Agreement (SLA).	Costs of the SLA (£186K) does not deliver VFM and high standards of service.	Tenants and leaseholders are not receiving an excellent service for the service charges they are paying. Can the service be delivered internally whilst demonstrating VFM?	Estates and Caretaker services manager	09/09/2008	4	3	12	(SIP 3.2H)Review ongoing and report to be submitted to EMT June /July 2009. Review document completed , supporting report completed end Sept for DMT Reports considered as part of the sheltered housing review and future delivery of the cleaning service in the sheltered schemes	Estates and Caretaker services Manager	01/07/09	4	2	8
34	LH9: Lost income from recharge and service charge payments due to lack of adequate 'in house' collection systems (SIP 3.2).	If SLA with Sundry Debtors is ended and inadequate collection arrangements have been made income streams will be interrupted.	Notice has been served on SLA, and no 'in house' collection systems exist at present.	Leaseholder & Rechargeable Repairs Manager	11/06/2009	3	4	12	SIP Action 3.2 to end the SLA will actually bring this risk about. SIP Action 3.1 will mitigate against some of it (service charges) but plans for recharging module of Northgate are still formative. Currently working with NCC to improve reporting for performance stats including collection rates. This information is reported on a quarterly basis to the Performance Team. Further implementation of improved escalation policy (Tested), in-house training to affected staff, on-going support from ICT, NCC and Northgate Daily Income monitoring of 37***** Service charge account as well as arrangements made by DD and SO. Reported to BID Team	Leaseholder & Rechargeable Repairs Manager	In operation and ongoing	2	3	6
35	LH10: Adverse effect on the proposed revision of the management charge	If fee is revised there is a risk of the NCH receiving bad publicity of increasing the fee	Ensure customers understand the process and why it is necessary to revise the charge	Leaseholder & Rechargeable Repairs Manager	11/06/2009	4	3	12	Training and full consultation with leaseholders. Publicity campaign explaining our reasons for the proposed change	Leaseholder & Rechargeable Repairs Manager	In operation and ongoing	3	2	6
36	LH12: The cost of services provided are not recovered through the service charges	The lease states the cost of a service for lift replacement but not the principle of a sinking fund	NCH to approach Legal Services at NCC to propose to amend the wording in the lease.	Leaseholder & Rechargeable Repairs Manager	11/06/2009	4	4	16	Make recommendations to the NCC of proposed changes	Leaseholder & Rechargeable Repairs Manager	In operation and ongoing	2	4	8

Risk Number	Description of Risk	Description of Potential IMPACT (with estimated costs if possible)	Description of LIKELIHOOD Factors	Risk Owner	Date Risk Raised	LIKELIHOOD Rating	IMPACT Rating	RISK Score	Countermeasures & Additional Controls / Mitigations / Actions (including SIP references where relevant)	Action Owner	In Operation Target Date	Residual LIKELIHOOD Rating	Residual IMPACT Rating	Residual RISK Score
37	TEM6.1: Poor publicity and effect on staff morale of ongoing allocations investigation.	Effect on working relationships. Dealing with potential suspensions, investigations and dismissals. Potential negative public perception.	Very likely with more cases expected to be highlighted.	Assistant Director - TEM	2008-2009	5	5	25	Investigator employed. Staff advised of whistle blowing. Staff made aware where they can seek help. Counselling services available. Regular updates from CEO.	CEO	31.03.10	5	5	25
38	TEM6.2: Failure to effectively monitor SLA's and ensure they deliver VFM	SLA's do not deliver VFM for customers leading to increased service charges. Poor customer satisfaction with neighbourhoods and issues relating to SLA's.	Costs of all SLA's not known. Terms of some SLA's are vague Customers not fully engaged in determining standards for SLA's or monitoring those standards Unsure costs match expenditure	Assistant Director - TEM	2008-2009	4	4	16	SIP 3.1, 3.2 ,3.6, 3.22 Liaison Meetings with partners VMS and STATUS survey feedback Review of service charges with NCC underway Benchmarking. SIP responsibility delegated to AHMs. Peer reviews	Assistant Director - TEM	31.03.10	3	4	12
39	TEM6.3: Being vulnerable to compensation claims	Potential includes abandoned, cash collection, disposal of goods, decants - repairs and decommissioning, inappropriate advice, successions, staff injury/stress, mutual exchanges - repairs and health and safety	Number of recent and ongoing claims in most of these areas.	Assistant Director - TEM	2008-2009	5	5	15	SIP 3.19 Fully review and update all procedures. Use team briefings to update and train staff on new procedures. Investigate individual cases and ensure lessons are learned and that competency issues are discussed at EPDRs and One to Ones. TEAM scrutiny	Area Housing Managers	31.03.10	3	5	15
40	TEM6.4: Clarify long term role for housing office, e.g. Cash Collection, locations, contact centre. Risk of non DDA compliant offices.	Risks and uncertainty of change for customers and staff. Possible problems with staff claims and insurance cover. Cost of potential redundancies and decommissioning of offices.	Ability to establish and develop a medium term plan.	Assistant Director - TEM	2008-2009	4	3	12	SIP 3.14, 3.15, 3.18 Accommodation Strategy Board and EMT to make medium and long term decisions on the future of housing provision in neighbourhoods. Implement accommodation strategy actions. DDA issues now clarified. Part time opening underway at Bilborough, Victoria Centre and Lenton offices. Consultation on cash handling commencing Jan-10.	Assistant Director - TEM	31.03.10	3	3	9
41	TEM6.5: Failure to meet health and safety requirements.	Unsafe working practices and conditions. Possible danger to customers and staff. Possible legal challenges and non compliance with insurance requirements.	Capacity to implement health and safety procedures and monitor & develop consistency of knowledge.	Assistant Director - TEM	2008-2009	4	5	20	SIP 3.17 Comprehensive programme of risk assessments and training. Appropriate levels of support and guidance from support services. Training plan being developed Renewed H&S Policy being produced. H and S standard agenda item at EDTM. Programme of office health and safety inspections underway. Big push on fire safety - weekly meetings taking place to drive through critical work.	Area Housing Managers	31.03.10	3	5	15
42	TEM6.6: Failure to plan the role of Area Housing Offices following the accommodation review	Inconsistent service provision to customers, staff uncertainty and de-motivation, loss of impetus following 2 star achievement	Role of housing office in move to centralised service provision unclear. AHM role not defined.	Assistant Director - TEM	2008-2009	4	5	20	SIP 3.14, 3.15, 3.18 Accommodation strategy to be implemented. AHMs to agree role with EMT. Staff made aware of new roles and training provided. Customers consulted and involved in the change - TRAs and Area Panels.	Assistant Director - TEM	31.03.10	2	5	10

Risk Number	Description of Risk	Description of Potential IMPACT (with estimated costs if possible)	Description of LIKELIHOOD Factors	Risk Owner	Date Risk Raised	LIKELIHOOD Rating	IMPACT Rating	RISK Score	Countermeasures & Additional Controls / Mitigations / Actions (including SIP references where relevant)	Action Owner	In Operation Target Date	Residual LIKELIHOOD Rating	Residual IMPACT Rating	Residual RISK Score
43	TEM6.7: Failure to meet requirements of the Cash Handling Procedure	Possible errors made by cashiers and supervisors. Loss of revenue. Reputational loss.	Human errors Potential fraud. Not following procedures. Lack of management controls.	Assistant Director - TEM	2008-2009	4	5	20	SIP 3.5 , 3.19 Staff training Revised procedures Audit of procedures. 2 x ISO audits completed and results shared. Recent audits showed much improved results.	Area Housing Managers	31.03.10	2	5	10
44	HIM: Reduction of rental income collected as a result of payment method changes	Potential loss of income; affected offices & collectors received £7.5m in 2008/9. Reduction in customer satisfaction. Equality Impact issues with Collector clients in particular.	Up to 50% of payments are received at offices. Reluctance amongst some customers to change method. Wariness of DD & PP. Board decision required.	Rent & Leasehold Service Manager	01/12/2009	4	5	20	Effective consultation & communication with customers & stakeholders. Extensive alternative payment options. One to one support for vulnerable customers. Potentially affects just 14% of tenants (22.5% of those with some rent to pay).	Rent & Leasehold Service Manager/ Mark Lawson	31.03.10	2	4	8

Risk Matrix

Likelihood Rating	Almost Certain	5	5	10	15	20	25
	Likely	4	4	8	12	16	20
	Unlikely	3	3	6	9	12	15
	Improbable	2	2	4	6	8	10
	Remote	1	1	2	3	4	5
			1	2	3	4	5
			Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
			Impact Rating				

Numbers in the boxes are the "Risk Scores" which are equal to the product of the Impact and Likelihood "Risk Ratings".

Likelihood

HOW TO MEASURE LIKELIHOOD (Vertical Axis)		
LIKELIHOOD RATING	DESCRIPTION	CRITERIA
5. ALMOST CERTAIN	Almost certain to occur	81+% chance
4. LIKELY	More likely to occur than not	51-80% chance
3. UNLIKELY	Less likely to occur than to not	31-50% chance
2. IMPROBABLE	Low but not impossible	11-30% chance
1. REMOTE	Virtually impossible	0 to 10% chance

Impact

HOW TO MEASURE IMPACT (Horizontal Axis)		
IMPACT RATING	COST IMPACT	SCHEDULE IMPACT
5. CATASTROPHIC	Major increase (75+%)	Major delay (>50%)
4. MAJOR	Large increase (31-75%)	Large delay (31-50%)
3. MODERATE	Significant increase (11-30%)	Significant slip (11-30%)
2. MINOR	Small increase (4-10%)	Small schedule slip (4-10%)
1. NEGLIGIBLE	Negligible effect on projected cost (0-3%)	Negligible effect on projected schedule (0-3%)

ACTIONS REQUIRED AFTER ASSESSING INHERENT RISK

INHERENT RISK SCORES	CONCLUSION AND ACTION REQUIRED	RESIDUAL RISK SCORES	MONITORED BY (Timeliness)
1 to 4	<p><u>Acceptable level of risk.</u> No further action(s) required to reduce risk, but Action Owners shall ensure that the relevant controls are operating effectively. Existing controls for low risk areas shall be carefully reviewed to ensure that there are not too many controls in place i.e. lack of efficient use of resources.</p>	1 to 4	<p>SERVICE AREA MANAGERS / RROs (Quarterly)</p>
5 to 11	<p><u>Implementation of additional controls may be required.</u> The costs and benefits associated with implementing additional systems, controls, processes and procedures designed to mitigate individual risks shall be considered and implemented as deemed required. The relevant Director/RRRO/RRO or CRO may agree that no further action(s) should be taken, but this decision must be recorded on the risk register.</p>	5 to 11	
12 to 25	<p><u>Implementation of additional controls is required.</u> Directors/RRROs/RROs (and their teams) or the CRO (and the RMP) shall discuss, establish and implement additional systems, controls, processes and procedures designed to mitigate individual risks. If the decision is taken not to introduce additional controls or other measures to mitigate high level risks, approval must be sort from the Board. Any such agreement from should be recorded on the risk register.</p>	<p>1 to 4</p> <p>5 to 11</p> <p>12 to 25</p>	

* - Directors are ultimately responsible for deciding which risks are included on their Directorate Risk Registers and explaining any such omissions from SARRs.

Risk Register Construction Steps (for more detailed guidance see the Risk Management Cycle - Appendix 6 of the RMF)

- 1) Risk registers should be completed, reviewed and updated as per the requirements of Company's Risk Management Framework (available on the Company's internet site - see link towards the bottom of the following linked page):
http://www.nottinghamcityhomes.org.uk/customer_care/more_strategies.aspx
- 2) Risk Register Owners (RROs)/Responsible Officers (RRROs) should identify the individual risks associated with each corporate plan objective specified on the
- 3) "Risk Register" worksheet RROs/RRROs should identify any additional risks associated with their risk area under "Other duties, responsibilities & concerns" at the bottom of the "Risk Register" worksheet.
- 4) Each risk should be assigned a 'Risk Owner' (defined below) and a date when the risk was raised.
- 5) Where the risk register is aligned with a Service Improvement Plan (SIP) (see Summary worksheet) the SIP should be reviewed alongside the register to ensure that all risks associated with achieving SIP objectives are identified and included as necessary and cross referenced.
- 6) Value for Money, the Reputation of the Company & Financial Cost should be considered by all RROs/RRROs in relation to the risks in their areas.
- 7) RROs/RRROs should provide each risk with an impact and likelihood rating according to the "rules" set out on the "Risk Matrix" worksheet. The "Inherent/Prevailing Risk Score" will be calculated automatically. This is the initial score before Counter Measures or Controls in place to manage the Risk have been considered and is sometimes called the "natural" risk rank. Risks that have scores of 12,15,16,20 or 25 are serious risks with **HIGH** Risk Scores that require a bespoke management response.
- 8) RROs/RRROs should identify existing counter measures for each risk and assess whether they are adequate.
- 9) RROs/RRROs should identify additional actions to be taken (e.g. Controls / Mitigations / Countermeasure Actions or a Management Plan) if the existing counter measures are considered to be insufficient to manage each risk down to an acceptable level.
- 10) Each action identified as required to control risk should be assigned an 'Action Owner' (defined below). There will often be more than one Action Owner for each risk and Action Owners may be the peer of, or more senior to, the Risk Owner.
- 11) The key existing Counter Measures (step 7) and any new action(s) identified during step 8) should be summarised in the related column of the "Risk Register" worksheet, together with specific "In Operation Target Dates".
- 12) RROs/RRROs should then re-rank each risk with a "Residual" impact & likelihood rating according to the "rules" on the "Risk Matrix" worksheet. The final "Residual Risk Score" will be calculated automatically.
- 13) Directorate Risk Registers should only include risks with **HIGH** and **MEDIUM** Risk Scores.

Risk Register Validation (actions required of the RRRO, RRO and Company Secretary)

- a) Risk Registers should be reviewed & updated as per the requirements of the Risk Management Framework & evidenced as such through completion of the 'Summary' worksheet.
- b) Registers should be reviewed against all relevant Internal Audit reports to highlight any controls identified by IA as not being in place or not working effectively.
- c) The Risk Register review process should include the testing of a selection of counter measures/controls to ensure they are in place and working effectively.
- d) Evaluation Forms (included as Appendix D in the Risk Management Framework) should be used by Executive Directors, RRROs and RROs to evaluate the content of their risk registers against the Company's Risk Management Framework.

Definitions (for further definitions see the Company's Risk Management Framework - Appendix A)

- i) **Risk**: combination of the **probability** of an **event** & its **consequence**. The term **risk** is generally used only when there is at least the possibility of negative consequences. In some situations, risk arises from the possibility of deviation from expected outcomes or **events**.
- ii) **Consequence**: outcome of an **event**. There may be more than one consequence from an event. Consequences can range from positive to negative and can be expressed qualitatively and quantitatively.
- iii) **Probability**: extent to which an **event** is likely to occur. Degrees of belief about probability can be chosen as ranks, such as rare/unlikely/moderate/likely/almost certain.
- iv) **Event**: occurrence of a particular set of circumstances. The event can be certain or uncertain, with a single occurrence or a series of occurrences. The probability associated with the event can be estimated for a given period of time.
- v) **Risk management**: the process of controlling **risks** to ensure that they are reduced to an acceptable level.
- vi) **Likelihood** – an assessment is made of how likely the risk is to occur in practice.
- vii) **Impact** – an assessment is made on if the risk did occur, what would be the impact on the Company.
- viii) **Risk control**: actions implementing **risk management** decisions. Risk control may involve monitoring, re-evaluation and compliance with decisions.
- ix) **Risk response**: actions taken to mitigate a **risk**.
- x) **Risk reduction (mitigation)**: actions taken to lessen the **probability**, negative **consequences** or both, associated with a **risk**, through specific controls.
- xi) **Risk treatment**: process of selection and implementation of measures to modify **risk**. Risk treatment measures can include avoiding, optimising, transferring or retaining **risk**.
- xii) **Inherent (gross) risk**: the **exposure** arising from a **risk** before any action has been taken to manage it. Recurrent **risks** that arise through an organisations existence in an environment i.e. not necessarily through its actions or choices, are often referred to as inherent risks.
- xiii) **Residual risk**: the **exposure** arising from a specific **risk** after action has been taken to manage it (making the assumption that the action has been effective) i.e. **risk** remaining after **risk** treatment. Residual risk should be lower than the **inherent risk**.
- xiv) **Risk rating**: derived from the scoring mechanism and designed to allow the organisation to prioritise its **risk management** activities.
- xv) **Risk score**: each risk is assessed for **impact** and **likelihood** before considering what **controls** are in place to manage it. The resulting score is called the risk score and is derived from the factor of the individual **likelihood** and **impact** risk ratings.
- xvi) **Risk matrix**: the mechanism used to display the **risk scores** produced as a result of the various **risk ratings**.
- xvii) **In operation target date**: the target date by which all 'Additional Controls, Mitigations and Countermeasure Actions', adopted to address specific **risks**, have been established and implemented.
- xviii) **Risk Register Owners (RROs)**: responsible for reviewing, updating and managing (primarily) Service Area Risk Registers, (but also) the Corporate Register and project or programme risk registers.
- xix) **Risk Register Responsible Officers (RRROs)**: responsible for reviewing, updating and managing Directorate Risk Registers.
- xx) **Risk Owners**: responsible for individual risks assigned.
- xxi) **Action Owners**: responsible for taking the actions needed to control the risk, as authorised by the Risk Owner.